

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/751,189	MATLOUB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isis A. Ghali	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Isis A. Ghali. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Dennis Drehkoff. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Claims of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Isis Ghali
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner informed Mr. Drehkoff that the application is in condition for allowance subjected to amending claims 28 to recite delivery of the therapeutic agent from the microchannels to the polymer cell foam and to the enrobing material, as well as to the skin from the microchannels to avoid duplication of claim 1. The examiner also suggested amending the claims to recite the porous polymer foam layer as open cell foam wherever the term "foam" appears. The dependency of claim 19 will be changed from claim 8 to claim 1 because claim 8 is canceled. Mr. Drehkoff agreed and authorized the examiner to amend the claims by examiner amendment. Mr. Drehkoff is going to fax a copy of the proposed amendment for the examiner convenience.

disghal